

REMARKS**(Amendment C-Ser. No.09/352,192)**

By the foregoing amendment, applicant has amended the claims to more distinctly define and emphasize the more important features of the invention that distinguish over the prior art. The claims now clearly define a card package production system in which cards are prevented from being attached to a matching carrier if a card is determined to have been incorrectly prepared by comparison of card information with card information that is stored apart from the cards and the carriers. Preferably, this information that is stored apart is also card information that is used to produce the card.

In response to the rejection of the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, submitted herewith is a terminal disclaimer under 37 CFR 1.321(c). Accordingly, there is no longer a basis for rejection of the claims on this basis and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims under 35USC102(b) as being anticipated by Hill et al. (U.S. patent 4,034,210) is respectfully requested for the same reasons set forth in the remarks to the last two amendments. A rejection under Section 102 requires that each and every one of the elements of the claim appear in the references. As previously explained in detail, there are three elements of the claim that are lacking from the reference:

"Thus, as illustrated above, the Hill et al. '210 patent completely lacks three features of claim 1, each of which is critical to the invention: (1) Hill et al. '210 lacks any means whatsoever for producing

cards (only making match-mismatch determinations), as specified in the preamble); (2) Hill et al. lacks any means for determining whether a card has been "incorrectly prepared" (only making mismatch determinations), as specified in the second element of the claim; and (3) there are no means for preventing an "incorrectly prepared card" from being attached to a matching carrier.


In Hill there is no card information stored apart from the cards and the carriers and thus there can be no comparison with this information to determine whether a card has been incorrectly prepared. Also, there is no means in Hill for preventing an incorrectly prepared card that matches a carrier from being attached to a carrier. The only comparison performed by Hill is the comparison of card information carried by the cards with carrier information carried by the carriers. If there is a match between card information with carrier information, then in Hill the card is attached to the carrier regardless of whether the card has been incorrectly prepared. Accordingly, there is no possibility that the Hill reference can anticipate any of the claims under 35 U.S.C 102(a). The rejection of the claims on this basis should therefore be withdrawn.

It should be equally clear that there is nothing in Hill or any other reference that suggest the subject matter of the claims as now amended.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims at

issue is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,




James W. Potthast,
Reg. No. 26,792

Law Offices of
Potthast & Associates
2712 North Ashland Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60614-1106

voice: 1-312-466-9660
fax: 1-312-466-9661

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION BY FACSIMILE (37 CFR 1.8)

I hereby certify that the forgoing PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME(1-page); AMENDMENT C(6-pages) and accompanying AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER (1-page) and fax transmittal form (1-page) are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office(Fax. No. 703-872-9306) on this 16th day of June, 2004.


Sara M. Potthast